

the status of the nurse. The New York bill, although by no means an ideal one, is an advance movement, for it provides a system of registry for regularly trained nurses who shall have passed a satisfactory examination before a Board of Examiners appointed by the Regents of the University of New York. Nurses passed by the board will each receive a license as registered nurse and may attach R. N. to their names, as may also nurses already qualified by long service. The writer in the *Hospital* supplement also falls foul of the length of time considered sufficient for the training of a nurse in the American acts—i.e., two years. He does not think two years enough, but wants an ideal of at least three-years' training and with a minimum age of twenty-five years for the holder of a license. It is an obvious truth that nurses should be thoroughly qualified for the work that falls to their lot. The only way to reach such an end is that they should give evidence that they have been well trained, and should pass an examination before they are permitted to act as nurses. It would be manifestly to the benefit of all concerned if every State were to pass bills for the registration of nurses embodying these principles. The status of nurse at the present time is ill-defined, and the whole question of nursing is in an unsatisfactory condition.—*Editorial Comment, Medical Record.*

---

*To the Editor of the Medical Record:*

SIR: The so-called "professional nurses" have been making strong endeavors in different States, with some success, for direct professional registration in the laws of the land and State registration on the same or similar lines to those accorded to the medical profession. That this is a justifiable move is beyond question. It should guarantee to the public a means of distinguishing between the trustworthy and competent person and the contrary by separating the graduated from the non-graduated nurse. The guarantee, however, is by no means infallible. Some "training-schools for nurses" are still too much "trade schools," even as there are still too many such among our medical schools. The question at issue is, How much fundamental knowledge should a professional trained nurse have? By fundamental is meant scientific knowledge, fundamental acquaintance with the "theories" of the work and the "reason why" of his or her acts. That a man or woman can be trained or drilled to be reliable in work, and yet know little or nothing of the science of it, even as a soldier can be drilled in his duties and still know nothing of the science of war, is not only self-evident, but practically even more than the present training-schools have generally attained to. A writer on this subject has recently claimed that the trained nurse should be competent to make every clinical test of urine, blood, or diseased product. That can be done, even as an engineer can be taught to run a locomotive and yet know nothing of the science of mechanics. Another question is, Who should decide on the standard of education of the professional nurses—the nurse organizations, the faculties or managers of the training-schools, or the medical profession? It would seem that this question should be entirely in the hands of the medical profession. If the physicians and surgeons do not know what is required of the nurse, who does? As to the "faculties" of training-schools, their opinions are not worth much where those schools are sort of independent institutions, having hospital connections, but not a part of great public hospitals. The training-schools are more or less like the medical. Too many of them are of a semi-private nature, for the "good" of those directly interested, the public and the student-nurses being consistently and persistently exploited for that "good" and little else.

The organizations of professional nurses, like many a medical society, have also the same weakness. They are liable to get under the control of ambitious persons who desire to shine before the public. What is worse, these "leaders" are saturated with a "will-o'-the-wisp" idealism which is pure moonshine, shadowed by intellectual cloudiness.

To return to that fundamental question—Does the professional nurse require a more or less profound education in the scientific bases of medicine in connection with an exact training in practical routine? If so, how much, and where is the nurse to get that scientific instruction? Certainly not in any of the existing training-schools as now organized. The "probation course" of two, three, or six months, or even a year, generally demanded is of little or no use except to obtain a very general idea of the student's fitness, physical more than mental. It is largely comparable to the "one-year's reading with some practitioner," now traditional, that formerly prevailed in our medical education. If the medical profession and public service require scientifically educated nurses, then that education must and should be given in institutions entirely free from any hospital connections, and should be free. In other words, the respective States should establish a State normal or preparatory school for nurses where these fundamentals and all laboratory drilling should be taught. The term should be of two-years' duration, with three months' vacation between the first and second year. Graduated students should then be apportioned out to the respective public hospitals and institutions for another term of two years. Finally, on receiving a certificate of competency from the hospital the student-nurses should be examined by a State board, registered, and given their diploma of competency. While private or semi-public (endowed) hospitals might have the privilege of employing uncertified attendants, they should be strictly forbidden issuing any certificates indicating any kind of proficiency to any such employes, and if requiring "professional" nurses should be obliged to apply to the State Board of Registration for them. Complaints as to unfitness or improper conduct of registered nurses should be made to the State Board of Registration, which should have the power to place the nurse on "probation," or withdraw a certificate altogether in warranted cases.—MEDICUS, in *Medical Record*.



THE ALUMNÆ ASSOCIATION OF THE TORONTO GENERAL HOSPITAL TRAINING-SCHOOL FOR NURSES.—Conforming with the expressed wishes of many of the members that the association should adopt a distinctive emblem and embody the same in a brooch-pin, the special committee appointed, after availing itself of the best authorities, decided to adopt the pomegranate, with the motto "Ut prosim," as best expressing the ideals of the nursing profession.

The pomegranate since early days has been used in medicine and is also emblematical of good works. With the motto "Ut prosim" ("That I may be of service") the design is particularly appropriate for a nurses' association.

This brooch is made of solid gold and carmine red enamel representing a half section of the pomegranate, the seeds of the fruit showing in pearls. The motto is engraved on the two crossed leaves at the base. A slight idea of its appearance may be gathered from the design above.